



1	IN THE FAMILY COURT OF THE FIRST CIRCUIT			
2	STATE OF HAWAII			
3) (
4				
5	STATE OF HAWAII) F.C.C.R. NO. 93-0001			
6	vs.			
7	REGINA SMITH,			
8	Defendant.)			
9	STATE OF HAWAII) F.C.C.R. NO. 93-0001			
10) vs.)			
11	FRANCIS NAKAMURA, JR.,)			
12	Defendant.			
13)			
14	· ·			
15				
16	TRANSCRIPT			
17	of the proceedings had in the above-entitled matter on			

of the proceedings had in the above-entitled matter on the 27th day of September, 1993, before the HONORABLE LINDA K. C. LUKE, Judge, presiding.

20

18

19

21

22

23

24

25





· 1	APPEARANCES:		
2	DAVID MINKIN Deputy Prosecuting Attorney	Attorney for the State of	
3		Hawaii	
4	JACK TONAKI Deputy Public Defender	Attorney for	Regina Smith
5			
6	GEORGE PARKER, III	Attorney for Nakamura,	
7		Nakamura,	01.
8			
9			
10	REPORTED BY:		
11	CYNTHIA TANDO Official Court Reporter Circuit Court of the First Circuit State of Hawaii		
12			
13			
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			

-3-

MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 27, 1993 10:47 a.m. 1 (The following proceedings were held in open 2 court out of the presence of the jury:) 3 THE CLERK: Calling Family Court 4 Criminal Number 93-0001, State of Hawaii versus Regina 5 Smith and Francis Nakamura, Jr. for further jury 6 trial. 7 THE COURT: Good morning, counsel. 8 Your appearances? 9 MR. MINKIN: Good morning, Your Honor. 10 David Minkin, Deputy Prosecuting Attorney, on behalf 11 of the State of Hawaii substituting for Jeff Rosell. 12 Also present with me is June Morimatsu, paralegal 13 assigned to assist on this case. 14 THE COURT: Thank you. 15 MR. PARKER: Good morning, Your Honor. 16 George Parker making an appearance before this 17 Honorable Court for Francis Nakamura, who is also 18 19 present. MR. TONAKI: Good morning, Your Honor. 20 Jack Tonaki on behalf of Regina Smith. I'm standing 21 in for Timothy Ho. 22 THE COURT: Okay. Thank you. Please 23 be seated. 24 Counsel, I do have just a few housekeeping 25

items. I would like the record to reflect, thanks to Miss Kubo, that there are clean sets of the instructions sequenced in the order that the Court expects to read them to the jury. And I count 49 pages, although I think it should be 50 because I had combined two instructions on one page.

Secondly, with respect to the verdict forms, Mr. Minkin, have you had an opportunity to review these?

MR. MINKIN: Yes, Your Honor, I've reviewed the verdict forms as to both defendants. They appear to be in order and the State has no objection to the verdict forms.

THE COURT: And the jury communication form?

MR. MINKIN: The State has also reviewed that and no objection in that it appears in order.

THE COURT: Thank you.

Mr. Parker?

MR. PARKER: Yes, Your Honor, I've reviewed the jury verdict forms as well as the jury communication form with regard to Francis Nakamura. I have no objections.

THE COURT: Thank you.

Mr. Tonaki?

MR. TONAKI: Your Honor, no objection to the verdict forms and communication forms.

THE COURT: Thank you.

Secondly, with respect to the Court's suggestion that a copy of the indictment be furnished to the jury, I have reconsidered since I have heard objections in our bench conference from Mr. Parker and Mr. Tonaki, although I believe Mr. Minkin was agreeable to doing so. I will rely upon the jury instructions to guide the jury as to the substance of the counts.

Now, Mr. Parker, is that correct, you had objected?

MR. PARKER: I had objected, Judge. Thank you very much.

THE COURT: And, Mr. Tonaki?

MR. TONAKI: Yes, we had objected also,

Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. Thirdly, with respect to the, I guess, logistics, if counsel does not object, I'd like to put it on record at this point that, I take it, there will be an agreement by counsel that the bailiff may take the jury to lunch without the necessity of formally reconvening in open court;

secondly, that the clerk will notify you once the jury panel is taken to lunch; thirdly, that if the jury does not reach a verdict by the close of business, which generally will be 4 o'clock, the bailiff may excuse them with the admonishment not to discuss the case and to have them return to the jury room to resume their deliberations on the case at 8:30 the next working day. Does counsel agree to this? Mr. Minkin?

MR. MINKIN: Your Honor, I have no objection. I would also recommend, I don't think it's necessary to notify us if they go to lunch between 11:30 and noon, and come back between 1:00 and 1:30.

THE COURT: No, I do need to notify you because our luncheon times may vary and I expect that counsel will be within instant contact by telephone and at least a 15-minute radius of any physical bench conferences we need to have or in person. Thank you.

Mr. Parker?

MR. PARKER: No objection, Judge. The only thing I would like to know is, if -- when you call to let us know they're going to lunch, will you please indicate to us where they are going? I have found in the past, I like to avoid where my jurors are going because that can only hurt me. Whether they

```
-7-
      think I'm trying to curry favor or something else, for
 1
      me, I like to know where they are going so I don't go
 2
      there. Otherwise, no objection.
 3
                     THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.
 4
                Mr. Tonaki?
 5
                     MR. TONAKI: No objection.
 6
                     THE COURT: In addition, I take it, Mr.
 7
      Parker, does your client waive his presence at any
 8
      jury communication conferences?
 9
                     MR. PARKER: Yes, Judge.
10
                     THE COURT: And how about Mr. Tonaki?
11
                     MR. TONAKI: Yes, Your Honor.
12
                     THE COURT:
                                 Okay. Mr. Nakamura, is
13
      that correct?
14
                     MR. PARKER: If I may have a moment,
15
      Judge?
16
                     THE COURT: Sure.
17
                (Counsel and client conferring.)
18
                     DEFENDANT NAKAMURA: Yes.
19
                                 Okay. And, Mr. Tonaki, you
                     THE COURT:
20
      had a chance to confer?
21
                     MR. TONAKI: I've had a chance to
22
     confer with Ms. Smith, Your Honor, and she is also
23
     agreeable to that.
24
                     THE COURT:
                                 Okay.
25
```

Now, Ms. Smith, you know that, for the record, your attorney has the flu and Mr. Tonaki is filling in. That's the best arrangement we have today. It is not my intent to advise the jury as to the reason for Mr. Ho's absence as it was not my intent nor did I so inform the jury as to the reason for Mr. Rosell's absence.

So, Ms. Smith, do you have any objection to that?

DEFENDANT SMITH: No, I don't.

THE COURT: Okay. Please be seated.

In addition, counsel will be notified by telephone when the jury is released for the evening. Please leave your telephone contact numbers with the clerk of court. And let this Court know if you have an emergency that will necessitate your absence.

At this time I'd like to have the jury in so we can get on with the jury instructions.

Anything further? If not, thank you.

(The following proceedings were held in open court in the presence of the jury:)

THE COURT: Please be seated. Please recall the case.

THE CLERK: Calling Family Court
Criminal Number 93-0001, State of Hawaii versus Regina

Smith and Francis Nakamura, Jr. for further jury trial.

THE COURT: Thank you.

The record will indicate the presence of the jury.

Thank you for your patience, noting that each of you have rushed to the courtroom.

Also, I will note that we have two substitutions; that is Mr. Minkin on behalf of Mr. Rosell for the State of Hawaii, and Mr. Jack Tonaki on behalf of Mr. Ho who represents Ms. Smith.

So formally, for the record, I would like their appearances starting with the prosecution.

MR. MINKIN: Thank you, Your Honor.

Good morning. David Minkin, Deputy Prosecuting

Attorney, on behalf of the State of Hawaii. Also

present with me is June Morimatsu, paralegal assigned
to assist on this case.

MR. PARKER: Good morning, Your Honor, ladies and gentlemen of the jury. George Parker making an appearance before this Honorable Court. Francis Nakamura is also present.

MR. TONAKI: Good morning, Your Honor.

Jack Tonaki on behalf of Regina Smith. Ms. Smith is present.

THE COURT: Thank you.

We talked about entering the final phase of the trial process. You indeed have been very diligent in meeting your duties. It is now the time for the Court, as the judge of the law in the case, to give you the specific legal instructions that will guide you during your very important deliberations.

Remember four things, three of which will be given to you in the jury deliberation room; all of the official court exhibits.

And, for the record, I'd like to have Ms. Kubo recite for counsel the exhibits that will go in the packet.

Ms. Kubo, do you have those?

THE CLERK: Be Exhibits 12, 20, 23, 26, 30, 31, 32 and 33, and those are State's. And defense S-3, which is for Ms. Smith, and S-4.

THE COURT: Thank you.

Mr. Minkin, is that consistent with the State's understanding?

MR. MINKIN: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. And Mr. Parker?

MR. PARKER: Yes, Judge.

THE COURT: And Mr. Tonaki?

MR. TONAKI: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you.

Number two, you will receive a clean set of the jury instructions. And number three, you will also receive a copy of what we call verdict forms. And the instructions are obviously self-explanatory, so please bear that in mind. The fourth thing that you will take into the jury deliberation room will be your recollection, your independent and collective recollection of what has been testified to by the witnesses in the case or any of the evidence that was proffered to you that is in evidence. Remember that the Court cannot furnish you with a transcript of instant replay, so it's crucial that you remember this.

At this time it is my duty to instruct you. There are 50 pages of instructions. I'd ask that you pay very close attention to each of these instructions as they will be your guide throughout your deliberation.

The Court will now instruct you in the law which you must follow in arriving at your verdict.

You are the exclusive judges of the facts of this case. However, you must follow these instructions even though you may disagree.

You must consider all of the instructions

together and consider each instruction in light of all the others. Do not single out or give greater emphasis to any word, phrase, sentence or instruction and ignore the others even if it is repeated. The order in which the instructions are given is not important.

You must consider only the evidence which has been presented to you in this case in light of your own observations, life experiences and common sense.

The indictment is a mere formal accusation and it is not evidence of either defendants' guilt. You must not be influenced at all because each defendant has been charged with offenses.

Trial procedures are governed by rules. When an attorney believes that the rules require it, it is the attorney's duty to raise an objection. It is the duty of the trial judge to rule on such objections. Do not consider for any purpose the nature or number of objections made during the trial by any attorney.

Anything said by the attorneys is not evidence. You should consider what they have said to you, but you are not bound by what they remember or how they see the evidence. You must also disregard

anything I said unless it was an instruction to you.

If I have in any way suggested or expressed to you that I favor one side or the other, or how I would resolve any issue in this case, I instruct you to disregard it.

You must not be influenced by pity for either defendant, or by passion or prejudice against either defendant. Both the prosecution and each defendant have a right to demand, and they do demand and expect, that you will be -- excuse me, that you will conscientiously and dispassionately consider and weigh all the evidence and follow these instructions and that you will reach a just verdict.

You must presume each defendant is innocent of the charges. This presumption remains with each defendant throughout the trial of the case unless and until the prosecution proves each defendant guilty beyond a reasonable doubt.

The presumption of innocence is not a mere slogan but an essential part of the law that you must follow. It places upon the prosecution the duty of proving every material element of the offenses charged against each defendant beyond a reasonable doubt.

You must not find each defendant guilty upon mere suspicion or upon evidence which only shows that

each defendant is probably guilty. What the law requires is not suspicion, not probabilities, but proof of each defendant's guilt beyond a reasonable doubt.

What is reasonable doubt -- or what is a reasonable doubt?

It is a doubt in your mind about each defendant's guilt which arises from the evidence presented or from the lack of evidence and which is based upon reason and common sense.

Each of you must decide individually whether there is or is not such a doubt in your mind after careful and impartial consideration of the evidence.

Be mindful, however, that a doubt which has no basis in the evidence, or the lack of evidence, or a doubt which is based upon imagination, suspicion, or a doubt -- excuse me, or mere speculation or guesswork is not reasonable doubt.

What is proof beyond a reasonable doubt?

If, after consideration of the evidence and the law, you have a reasonable doubt of each defendant's guilt, then the prosecution has not proved each defendant's guilt beyond a reasonable doubt and it is your duty to find each defendant not guilty.

If, after consideration of the evidence and

the law, you do not have a reasonable doubt of each defendant's guilt, then the prosecution has proved each defendant's guilt beyond a reasonable doubt and it is your duty to find each defendant guilty.

You must disregard entirely any matter which the Court has ordered stricken.

You must accept as conclusively proved any fact to which the parties made -- or, excuse me, have stipulated.

There are two types of evidence -- direct evidence, such as the testimony of an eyewitness, and circumstantial evidence, which permits a reasonable inference of the existence of another fact.

The law makes no distinction between direct and circumstantial evidence. Facts may be proved by, and the jury may consider and rely on either or both direct and circumstantial evidence.

while you must consider all of the evidence in determining the facts in this case, this does not mean that you must give every bit of evidence the same weight. You are the sole judges of the effect and value of the evidence.

You, as jurors, are the sole judges of the credibility of all witnesses and the weight their testimony deserves. It is your exclusive right to

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

determine whether and to what extent a witness should be believed and to give weight to the testimony accordingly. In evaluating a witness, you may consider the witness' appearance and demeanor; manner of testifying; intelligence; apparent candor or frankness, or lack thereof; interest, if any, in the result of this case; any relation to any party; temper, feeling or bias; and means and opportunity of acquiring information. You may also consider the probability or improbability of the witness' testimony; whether the witness is supported or contradicted by other evidence; whether the witness has made contradictory statements during the trial or at other times; and all other circumstances surrounding the witness and bearing upon the witness' credibility.

Inconsistencies or discrepancies in the testimony of a witness, or between the testimony of different witnesses, may or may not cause the jury to discredit such testimony. In weighing the effect of inconsistencies or discrepancies, consider whether they concern matters of importance or only matters of unimportant detail, and whether they result from innocent error or from willful lying.

If you find that a witness has intentionally

lied or overstated or tried to hide any important fact, then you may reject all or any part of that witness' testimony.

You are not bound to decide a fact one way or the other just because more witnesses testify on one side than the other. It is testimony that has a convincing force upon you that counts, and the testimony of even a single witness, if believed, can be sufficient to prove a fact.

The prosecution is not required to call as witnesses all persons who may have been present at any of the events disclosed by the evidence or who may appear to have some knowledge of these events, or to produce all objects or documents mentioned or suggested by the evidence.

Each defendant has no duty or obligation to call any witnesses or produce any evidence.

Each defendant in this case has testified.

When each defendant testifies, his or her credibility is to be tested in the same manner as any other witness.

Several times during the trial certain evidence was allowed into this trial only for a particular and limited purpose. When you consider that evidence, you must limit your consideration to

that purpose only.

During the trial you heard the testimony of one or more witnesses who were described as experts.

Training and experience may make a person an expert in a particular field. The law -- excuse me, the law allows that person to state an opinion about matters in that field. Merely because such a witness has expressed an opinion does not mean, however, that you must accept this opinion. It is up to you to decide whether to accept this testimony and how much weight to give it. You must also decide whether the witness' opinions were based on sound reasons, judgment and information.

Counts 6, 7, 8, 9, 11, 18, 19, 20 and 21 in this case have been charged against Defendant Francis Nakamura, Jr.

Counts 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 13, 14, 15, 16 and 17 in this case have been charged against Defendant Regina Smith.

You must give separate consideration to the evidence that applies to each individual defendant.

You must consider separately each count charged against each individual defendant.

Each defendant is entitled to have his or her case decided solely on the evidence that applies

to him or her. Some of the evidence in this case was limited to one of the defendants and cannot be considered in the cases of the other. You must limit your consideration of that evidence to the defendant as to whom the evidence was admitted.

Our State law defines, quote, knowingly, unquote, as follows:

A person acts knowingly with respect to his or her conduct when he or she is aware that his or her conduct is of that nature.

A person acts knowingly with respect to attendant circumstances when he or she is aware that such circumstances exist.

A person acts knowingly with respect to a result of his or her conduct when he or she is aware that it is practically certain that his or her conduct will cause such a result.

The state of mind which a person commits an act such as, quote, knowingly, unquote, may be proved by circumstantial evidence. While an eyewitness can give direct evidence of what a person did or didn't do, there can be no eyewitness to a person's state of mind. But what a person does or fails to do may or may not indicate the state of mind with which he or she does or refrains from doing an act.

In Count 6, Defendant Francis Nakamura, Jr. is charged with the offense of Sexual Assault in the First Degree.

A person commits the offense of Sexual
Assault in the First Degree if he knowingly subjects
to sexual penetration another person who is less than
14 years old.

There are three material elements to this offense, each of which must be proven by the prosecution beyond a reasonable doubt. The three elements are:

One, that Francis Nakamura, Jr. subjected Alisha Perry to sexual penetration by inserting his penis into her vagina;

Two, that Francis Nakamura, Jr. did so knowingly; and

Three, at the time of the incident, Alisha Perry was less than 14 years old.

In Count 7, Defendant Francis Nakamura, Jr. is charged with the offense of Sexual Assault in the First Degree.

A person commits the offense of Sexual
Assault in the First Degree if he knowingly subjects
to sexual penetration another person who is less than
14 years old.

There are three material elements to this offense, each of which must be proven by the prosecution beyond a reasonable doubt.

The three elements are:

One, that Francis Nakamura, Jr. subjected Alisha Perry to sexual penetration by inserting his penis into her mouth;

Two, that Francis Nakamura, Jr. did so knowingly; and

Three, at the time of the incident, Alisha Perry was less than 14 years old.

In Count 8, Defendant Francis Nakamura, Jr. is charged with the offense of Sexual Assault in the First Degree.

A person commits the offense of Sexual
Assault in the First Degree if he knowingly subjects
to sexual penetration another person who is less than
14 years old.

There are three material elements to this offense, each of which must be proven by the prosecution beyond a reasonable doubt.

The three elements are:

One, that Francis Nakamura, Jr. subjected Alisha Perry to sexual penetration by inserting his finger into her vagina;

Two, that Francis Nakamura, Jr. did so knowingly; and

Three, at the time of the incident, Alisha Perry was less than 14 years old.

In Count 9, Defendant Francis Nakamura, Jr. is charged with the offense of Sexual Assault in the First Degree.

A person commits the offense of Sexual
Assault in the First Degree if he knowingly subjects
to sexual penetration another person who is less than
14 years old.

There are three material elements to this offense, each of which must be proven by the prosecution beyond a reasonable doubt.

The three elements are:

One, that Francis Nakamura, Jr. subjected Alisha Perry to sexual penetration by inserting his toe into her vagina;

Two, that Francis Nakamura, Jr. did so knowingly; and

Three, at the time of the incident, Alisha Perry was less than 14 years old.

In Count 11, Francis Nakamura, Jr. is charged with the offense of Sexual Assault in the First Degree -- excuse me, strike that.

In Count 11, Francis Nakamura, Jr. is charged with the offense of Sexual Assault in the Third Degree.

A person commits the offense of Sexual
Assault in the Third Degree if he knowingly has sexual
contact with another person who is less than 14 years
old and not his spouse.

There are four material elements to this offense, each of which must be proven by the prosecution beyond a reasonable doubt.

The four elements are:

One, that Francis Nakamura, Jr. had sexual contact with Alisha Perry by placing his hand on her breast;

Two, that Francis Nakamura did so knowingly;

Three, at the time of the incident, Alisha

Perry was less than 14 years old; and

Four, at the time of the incident, Alisha Perry was not married to Francis Nakamura.

In Count 18, Defendant Francis Nakamura, Jr. is charged with the offense of Sexual Assault in the First Degree.

A person commits the offense of Sexual

Assault in the First Degree if he knowingly subjects
to sexual penetration another person who is less than

14 years old.

There are three material elements to this offense, each of which must be proven by the prosecution beyond a reasonable doubt.

The three elements are:

One, that Francis Nakamura, Jr. subjected Jana Perry to sexual penetration by inserting his penis into her vagina;

Two, that Francis Nakamura, Jr. did so knowingly; and

Three, at the time of the incident, Jana
Perry was less than 14 years old.

In Count 19, Defendant Francis Nakamura, Jr. is charged with the offense of Sexual Assault in the First Degree.

A person commits the offense of Sexual
Assault in the First Degree if he knowingly subjects
to sexual penetration another person who is less than
14 years old.

There are three material elements to this offense, each of which must be proven by the prosecution beyond a reasonable doubt.

The three elements are:

One, that Francis Nakamura, Jr. subjected Jana Perry to sexual penetration by inserting his

penis into her mouth;

Two, that Francis Nakamura, Jr. did so knowingly; and

Three, at the time of the incident, Jana Perry was less than 14 years old.

In Count 20, Defendant Francis Nakamura, Jr. is charged with the offense of Sexual Assault in the First Degree.

A person commits the offense of Sexual
Assault in the First Degree if he knowingly subjects
to sexual penetration another person who is less than
14 years old.

There are three material elements to this offense, each of which must be proven by the prosecution beyond a reasonable doubt.

The three elements are:

One, that Francis Nakamura, Jr. subjected Jana Perry to sexual penetration by inserting his finger into her vagina;

Two, that Francis Nakamura, Jr. did so knowingly; and

Three, at the time of the incident, Jana Perry was less than 14 years old.

In Count 21, Defendant Francis Nakamura, Jr. is charged with the offense of Sexual Assault in the

First Degree.

A person commits the offense of Sexual
Assault in the First Degree if he knowingly subjects
to sexual penetration another person who is less than
14 years old.

There are three material elements to this offense, each of which must be proven by the prosecution beyond a reasonable doubt.

The three elements are:

One, that Francis Nakamura, Jr. subjected

Jana Perry to sexual penetration by inserting his toe

into her vagina;

Two, that Francis Nakamura, Jr. did so knowingly; and

Three, at the time of the incident, Jana Perry was less than 14 years old.

In Count 1, Defendant Regina Smith is charged with the offense of Sexual Assault in the First Degree.

A person commits the offense of Sexual Assault in the First Degree if she knowingly subjects to sexual penetration another person who is less than 14 years old.

There are three material elements to this offense, each of which must be proven by the

prosecution beyond a reasonable doubt.

Δ

The three elements are:

One, that Regina Smith subjected Alisha

Perry to sexual penetration by placing Regina Smith's

mouth on Alisha Perry's vagina;

Two, that Regina Smith did so knowingly; and
Three, at the time of the incident, Alisha
Perry was less than 14 years old.

In Count 2, Defendant Regina Smith is charged with the offense of Sexual Assault in the First Degree.

A person commits the offense of Sexual

Assault in the First Degree if she knowingly subjects
to sexual penetration another person who is less than
14 years old.

There are three material elements to this offense, each of which must be proven by the prosecution beyond a reasonable doubt.

The three elements material -- excuse me, the three elements are:

One, that Regina Smith subjected Alisha

Perry to sexual penetration by placing Alisha Perry's

mouth on Regina Smith's vagina;

Two, that Regina Smith did so knowingly; and Three, at the time of the incident, Alisha

Perry was less than 14 years old.

In Count 3, Defendant Regina Smith is charged with the offense of Sexual Assault in the First Degree.

A person commits the offense of Sexual
Assault in the First Degree if she knowingly subjects
to sexual penetration another person who is less than
14 years old.

There are three material elements to this offense, each of which must be proven by the prosecution beyond a reasonable doubt.

The three elements are:

One, that Regina Smith subjected Alisha

Perry to sexual penetration by placing Regina Smith's

finger in Alisha Perry's vagina;

Two, that Regina Smith did so knowingly; and
Three, at the time of the incident, Alisha
Perry was less than 14 years old.

In Count 4, Regina Smith is charged with the offense of Sexual Assault in the Third Degree.

A person commits the offense of Sexual
Assault in the Third Degree if she knowingly has
sexual contact with another person who is less than 14
years old and not her spouse.

There are four material elements to this

offense, each of which must be proven by the prosecution beyond a reasonable doubt.

The four elements are:

One, that Regina Smith had sexual contact with Alisha Perry by placing Alisha Perry's hand on Regina Smith's vagina;

Two, that Regina Smith did so knowingly;

Three, at the time of the incident, Alisha

Perry was less than 14 years old; and

Four, at the time of the incident, Alisha Perry was not married to Regina Smith.

In Count 5, Regina Smith is charged with the offense of Sexual Assault in the Third Degree.

A person commits the offense of Sexual
Assault in the Third Degree if she knowingly has
sexual contact with another person who is less than 14
years old and not her spouse.

There are four material elements to this offense, each of which must be proven by the prosecution beyond a reasonable doubt.

The four elements are:

One, that Regina Smith had sexual contact with Alisha Perry by placing Regina Smith's hand on Alisha Perry's breast;

Two, that Regina Smith did so knowingly;

Three, at the time of the incident, Alisha
Perry was less than 14 years old; and

Four, at the time of the incident, Alisha Perry was not married to Regina Smith.

In Count 13, Defendant Regina Smith is charged with the offense of Sexual Assault in the First Degree.

A person commits the offense of Sexual
Assault in the First Degree if she knowingly subjects
to sexual penetration another person who is less than
14 years old.

There are three material elements to this offense, each of which must be proven by the prosecution beyond a reasonable doubt.

The three elements are:

One, that Regina Smith subjected Jana Perry to sexual penetration by placing Regina Smith's mouth on Jana Perry's vagina;

Two, that Regina Smith did so knowingly; and
Three, at the time of the incident, Jana
Perry was less than 14 years old.

In Count 14, Defendant Regina Smith is charged with the offense of Sexual Assault in the First Degree.

A person commits the offense of Sexual

Assault in the First Degree if she knowingly subjects to sexual penetration another person who is less than 14 years old.

There are three material elements to this offense, each of which must be proven by the prosecution beyond a reasonable doubt.

The three elements are:

One, that Regina Smith subjected Jana Perry to sexual penetration by placing Jana Perry's mouth on Regina Smith's vagina;

Two, that Regina Smith did so knowingly; and
Three, at the time of the incident, Jana
Perry was less than 14 years old.

In Count 15, Regina Smith is charged with the offense of Sexual Assault in the Third Degree.

A person commits the offense of Sexual
Assault in the Third Degree if she knowingly has
sexual contact with another person who is less than 14
years old and not her spouse.

There are four material elements to this offense, each of which must be proven by the prosecution beyond a reasonable doubt.

The four elements are:

One, that Regina Smith had sexual contact with Jana Perry by placing Jana Perry's hand on Regina

Smith's vagina;

Two, that Regina Smith did so knowingly;

Three, at the time of the incident, Jana

Perry was less than 14 years old; and

Four, at the time of the incident, Jana

Perry was not married to Regina Smith.

In Count 16, Regina Smith is charged with the offense of Sexual Assault in the Third Degree.

A person commits the offense of Sexual
Assault in the Third Degree if she knowingly has
sexual contact with another person who is less than 14
years old and not her spouse.

There are four material elements to this offense, each of which must be proven by the prosecution beyond a reasonable doubt.

The four elements are:

One, that Regina Smith had sexual contact with Jana Perry by placing Regina Smith's hand on Jana Perry's vagina;

Two, that Regina Smith did so knowingly;

Three, at the time of the incident, Jana

Perry was less than 14 years old; and

Four, at the time of the incident, Jana Perry was not married to Regina Smith.

In Count 17, Regina Smith is charged with

the offense of Sexual Assault in the Third Degree.

A person commits the offense of Sexual
Assault in the Third Degree if she knowingly has
sexual contact with another person who is less than 14
years old and not her spouse.

There are four material elements to this offense, each of which must be proven by the prosecution beyond a reasonable doubt.

The four elements are:

One, that Regina Smith had sexual contact with Jana Perry by placing Regina Smith's hand on Jana Perry's breast;

Two, that Regina Smith did so knowingly;

Three, at the time of the incident, Jana

Perry was less than 14 years old; and

Four, at the time of the incident, Jana Perry was not married to Regina Smith.

Quote, sexual penetration, unquote, means vaginal intercourse, anal intercourse, fellatio, cunnilingus, analingus, deviate sexual intercourse, or any intrusion of any part of a person's body or of any object into the genital or anal opening of another person's body; it occurs upon any penetration, however slight, but emission is not required. Each act of sexual penetration shall constitute a separate

offense.

Quote, sexual contact, unquote, means any touching of the sexual or other intimate parts of a person not married to the actor, or of the sexual or other intimate parts of the actor by the person, whether directly or through the clothing or other material intended to cover the sexual or other -- excuse me, or other intimate parts.

Quote, cunnilingus, unquote, means the act, practice, or technique of orally stimulating the female genitalia.

Cunnilingus also includes the stimulation of the vulva, or clitoris, with the lips or tongue.

You must not discuss or consider the subject of penalty or punishment in your deliberations of this case.

A verdict must represent the considered judgment of each juror, and in order to return a verdict, it is necessary that all 12 jurors agree to it. In other words, your verdict must be unanimous.

Each of you must decide the case for yourself, but it is your duty to talk to one another and to deliberate with a purpose of reaching an agreement, if you can do so without violating your individual judgment. During your deliberations, do

not hesitate to re-examine your own views and change your opinion if convinced it is wrong. But do not give up your honest belief as to the weight or effect of evidence for the mere purpose of returning a verdict.

Upon retiring to the jury room, elect one of your members as foreperson to preside over your deliberations and be your spokesperson in court. You may take as much time as you feel is necessary for your deliberations. You may inform the Court if you have any questions or do not understand the Court's instructions.

When you reach a verdict, the foreperson must sign and date the appropriate verdict form.

Until you are through with your consideration of this case, it is necessary from this time that you remain together as a group. A bailiff and two clerks will be sworn to attend you.

Counsel, I've added "two clerks" because of our staffing situation.

A bailiff and two clerks will be sworn to attend you and help with problems you may have. If you need to communicate with the Court, send a note through the bailiff. Please do not attempt to communicate with the Court except in writing.

All of the evidence that you may consider in deciding this case has been presented to you during the trial. At all times, including your breaks from deliberations and when you are released to go home in the late afternoon, you must not attempt to gather any other information on your own which you think might be helpful. Do not engage in any outside reading on any matter having anything to do with this case. Do not refer to dictionaries or other outside sources. Do not visit any places mentioned in this case. Do not in any other way try to learn about the case outside the courtroom.

You must not discuss this case with anyone or permit anyone to discuss this case with you. You must not read or listen to news accounts about this case, if there are any.

You must not discuss this case with any person other than members of the jury. You must not reveal to the Court or to any other person how the jury stands, numerically or otherwise, until you have reached a unanimous verdict and it has been received by the Court.

As to each count, you may bring in either one of the following verdicts:

One, not guilty; or

Two, guilty as charged.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Your verdict must be unanimous.

After a verdict has been reached and your foreperson has signed and dated the verdict forms, you will notify the bailiff and court will be reconvened to receive the verdict.

May I have counsel at the bench with the reporter, please.

(The following proceedings were held at the bench:)

THE COURT: With respect to the reading of the instructions, are there any objections?

MR. MINKIN: None.

THE COURT: Mr. Parker?

MR. PARKER: None.

THE COURT: Mr. Tonaki?

MR. TONAKI: No objections.

THE COURT: Thank you. Thank you.

(End of bench conference.)

THE COURT: As further background for the members of the jury, you may have heard stories about jury deliberations going into the late evening or being sequestered. These things generally do not happen.

If you are unable to reach a verdict, you will be excused at 4 o'clock, as the preference of the

staff because of the need to transport our court reporter and other staff back to the Circuit Courthouse. In which case, if you are unable to reach a verdict by 4 o'clock each day, you will then be directed to return at 8:30 the following day to continue your deliberations.

While the Court does not discourage the use of the written communication forms, please be aware that due to mandatory procedures, it generally takes up to 45 minutes or more to respond to you. Even though we are in the age of technological advances, it is simply not physically possible for the Court to be able to confer with counsel and return a response to you in very short order.

Please also be aware that the Court cannot provide you, as I mentioned, with a transcript of the testimony that was given during the trial.

To assist you in performing your duties,
Miss Fontanilla will be providing you with the items
I've gone over; the verdict forms, the exhibits, a
copy of the instructions you've just received, and any
other supplies that you may require, such as paper,
pen, tape or note paper.

At this time, with respect to our diligent alternates, and that would be Miss Rapoza, Mr.

Strezepek and also Mr. Guzman, I wish to let you know that we appreciate the time and effort you have devoted to the case. But now that we do have the full panel, it would be my duty to excuse you from further service with the thanks of the Court.

I'd like to have you wait a few minutes, please, because Ms. Fontanilla will need to process you out.

And also, Madam Bailiff, I would like to see the three alternates in chambers to thank them.

And further, if Mr. Strezepek, Mr. Guzman and Miss Rapoza could excuse themselves from the box to sit next to the bailiff. Actually, Miss Fontanilla, perhaps they can wait in chambers and I'll be there shortly.

(Alternate jurors excused)

THE COURT: Thank you.

And at this time, could I have Miss Adeline Fontanilla raise her right hand, Miss Dawn Ching and Miss Edith Kubo for the oath.

(The bailiff and two clerks were sworn to take charge of the jury during deliberations.)

THE COURT: At this time a bailiff has been sworn to attend you. Miss Fontanilla will be directing your further schedule and activities.

At this time the members of the jury are excused to the deliberation room.

(At 11:39 a.m. the jury retired to commence its deliberations.)

THE COURT: The record will indicate that the jury has been excused from the courtroom.

Counsel, may I direct your further attention to the procedure, again, that we will be utilizing on any jury communications. That the Court will attempt to propose a mutual response. If there is an agreement, then a minute order will enter after we've made contact with you. If there is no agreement, I would ask counsel that you refer to item 13(a) and (b) on the jury trial guidelines. Each of you now have a copy?

MR. PARKER: Yes.

MR. MINKIN: Yes.

THE COURT: Mr. Minkin?

MR. MINKIN: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: And Mr. Tonaki?

MR. TONAKI: Yes.

THE COURT: Any questions?

MR. PARKER: No.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you. We

stand in recess.

```
-41-
                 If counsel, again, will furnish their phone
 1
      numbers to the court clerk. Thank you.
 2
                 (Whereupon, the proceedings recessed at
 3
      11:40 a.m., September 27, 1993.)
 4
 5
                            ---00000000---
 6
 7
 8
 9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

-42-CERTIFICATE STATE OF HAWAII CITY AND COUNTY OF HONOLULU I, CYNTHIA TANDO, an official court reporter of the Circuit Court of the First Circuit, State of Hawaii, do hereby certify that the foregoing pages numbered 1 through 41 contain a true and accurate transcript of the proceedings had in connection with the above-entitled matter. Dated this 16th day of December, 1993. Cynthia Tando CYNTHIA TANDO, C.S.R. No. 288